

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 26, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 4 to 14, 16 to 21, 23 to 33, 35 to 40, 42 to 52, 54 to 59, 61 to 71 and 73 to 76 remain in the application, of which Claims 1, 20, 39 and 58 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Turning first to a formal matter involving the drawings, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to review and to approve the drawings in this case, as filed originally on October 4, 2000.

Turning to the Office Action, Claims 58, 59, 61 to 71 and 73 to 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, it being said that the claimed invention was directed to non-statutory subject matter since it was directed to a computer program not stored on a computer-readable medium. In response, the rejected claims have been amended so as to specify a "computer-readable storage medium", and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), primarily over U.S. Patent No. 6,433,882 (Mori) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,270 (Cooper). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

As set forth in the amended claims herein, the invention concerns: distributed printing in which there are two types of distributed printing processes a first for a device-independent-format data and a second for a device-dependent-format data. A determination is made as to whether a plurality of printers for distributing printing can process the same printer language data. In a case where the plurality of printers cannot process the same printer language data, then the process for distributed printing using device-independent-format data is performed, whereas in a case where the plurality of

printers can process the same printer language data, the distributed printing process for device-dependent-format data is performed.

Mori and Cooper have both been reviewed but they are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the foregoing feature of two types of distributed printing processes, a first for a device-independent-format data and a second for a device-dependent-format data. As a consequence, no permissible combination of these patents could possibly disclose or suggest control so as to perform a process for device-independent-format data if there is a determination that the plurality of printers cannot process the same printer language data, and control so as to perform the process for a device-dependent-format data in a case where there is a determination that the plurality of printers can process the same printer language.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein recite subject matter that would have not been obvious from any permissible combination of the art cited against them, and allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 104110v1